


REYNOLDS HISTORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

u
ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1833 01360 5305



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Allen County Public Library Genealogy Center

JOHN HUMFREY

Massachusetts Magistrate



Did he marry the daughter
of the third Earl of Lincoln?



By Elroy McKendree Avery



Cleveland

1912

John Humfrey

1. THE QUESTION.

On the seventh of October, 1911, the *New York Times* printed a "special" communication from Cleveland saying that Elroy M. Avery had "discovered" that John D. Rockefeller "is a direct descendant of the first three Earls of Lincoln, and before that of some of the early Kings, ~~not only of England,~~ but of Scotland and France."

Two days later, the *Times* published a longer "special" from Cleveland, in which it said that

"Here is the pedigree as Mr. Avery gave it out to-night:

George Plantagenet, Duke of Clarence, married and had a daughter, Margaret, Countess of Salisbury, who married Sir Richard Pole, K. G., and had a son, Henry Pole, Baron Montacato, who married Lady Neville, and his daughter, Catharine Pole, married Francis Hastings, second Earl of Huntingdon, and had a daughter, Catherine Hastings, who married Henry Clinton, second Earl of Lincoln.

Thomas Clinton, third Earl of Lincoln, their son, married and had a daughter, Susan Clinton, who married Gen. John Humphrey, sword bearer of the Court of Justice of Trial of Charles I., and afterward Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts. Their daughter, Ann Humphrey, married William Palmes, whose daughter, Susan Palmes, married Oct. 27, 1686, Samuel Avery, born Aug. 14, 1666. Their son, Humphrey Avery, born July 4, 1699, married Feb. 5, 1724, Jerusha Morgan, whose son, Solomon Avery, born June 17, 1729, married Hannah Punderson and had a son, Miles Avery, born in 1769, at Norwich, Conn. He was a soldier in the Revolutionary War, and married Malinda Pixley and had a daughter, Lucy Avery, who married Godfrey Rockefeller and had a son, William Avery Rockefeller, who married Eliza Davison, and had a son, John Davison Rockefeller, born July 8, 1839."

On the day after that (Oct. 10, 1911), the *Times* had a still longer article concerning "the family tree provided for John D. Rockefeller by Elroy M. Avery of 2831 Woodhill Road, Cleveland, and author of historical works." This article (which occupies about two columns of the *Times*, forty-two inches, running measure) sets forth that "No one really knows who married Lady Susan Clinton, as the English records simply state that she took as her husband one Humphreys of Kent. Mr. Rockefeller's genealogist has identified this gentleman with Col. John Humphrey¹ of the Boston Colony, and in so doing, in Mr. Dickinson's opinion, has exhibited considerable boldness."

Then follows a letter signed Wharton Dickinson, for whom the *Times* vouches as "a well-known genealogical authority." In this letter and the two or three that he subsequently added, Mr. Dickinson quotes old writers on the early peerage of England, such as Collins, Burke, etc., and one American book, the "Humphrey Genealogy." His citations from his English authorities go to show that Thomas, the third Earl of Lincoln, was born in 1571, that he died in 1618-19, and that he was the father of eight sons and nine daughters, including "Susan who married ——— Humphreys of the County of Kent." The first two sons died young, and the next son, Theophilus, became the fourth Earl of Lincoln. Four of the daughters died young. It is stated that Susan was the seventh daughter, and perhaps she was, although none of the authorities cited give the date of her birth, and neither Mr. Dickinson nor I know when she was born. Lacking a date that is essential to his argument, Mr. Dickinson turns to the "Humphrey Genealogy" and says that therein he finds the statement "that John Humfrey, Jr., was 20 years of age in 1641, putting his birth in 1621." Assuming that this date, 1621, is correct, and affirming that the Lady Susan "could not possibly have been born before 1610" (a matter concerning which he knows absolutely nothing) he wisely doubts that "she could have had a son born in 1621" and concludes that it was impossible that the Massachusetts magistrate was the son-in-law of the third Earl of Lincoln, that

¹ The name is variously spelled Humfrey, Humphrey, and Humphreys.

there must have been two John Humphreys, that one of them married the daughter of the earl, and that the other came over sea with wife and children in 1634. From what he calls "The Humphrey Genealogy"² he then culls the names of John, Ann, Dorcas, Sarah, Theophilus, Thomas, Joseph, and Lydia, the eight children of "Col. John Humfrey of the Boston Colony, Assistant to the Governor," and triumphantly asks, "How does it come that Col. Humfrey did not have a daughter, Susan, named after her illustrious mother?"

The foregoing constitutes the whole case of the denying critic of the Susanna Palmes pedigree. After giving Mr. Dickinson's letter, the *Times* article continues: "Once Mr. Avery had overlooked these difficulties that Mr. Dickinson has raised and had assumed the identity of Humphrey of Kent and John Humphrey of Boston, his course was plain sailing." Here then we have the problem in a nutshell: *Was the Humphrey of Kent who married the daughter of the third Earl of Lincoln identical with the John Humfrey of Boston?*

As these and several other articles printed in the *Times* concerning the royal pedigree of the wife of Samuel Avery contain much that is erroneous, and as, owing to the prominence of one of the descendants of our Samuel and Susanna, the criticisms were widely copied by newspapers from Boston Bay to the Golden Gate (and by some printed in Europe), generally with implied acceptance of their conclusiveness, and sometimes with editorial comment, wise and otherwise, a reply seems to be in order. The lamentable and wide-spread unfamiliarity with the historical literature of colonial Massachusetts thus manifested fully justifies any earnest and honest attempt to throw a little light into some of the dark corners. As the pedigree pertains to the Groton (Connecticut) line of Averys, and as I am the historian of that clan, and as I am charged with the authorship of the pedigree in question, it clearly falls to me to make answer. Owing to the sudden death of my wife in

² The correct title of the book, which was published at New York in 1883, is *The Humphreys Family in America*. Its author was Frederick Humphreys, M. D., the manufacturer of the homeopathic remedies known as the Humphreys Specifics. He died in 1900.

December, 1911, the reply was delayed and, when it was sent, the *Times* declined to publish it on account of its length. The reply thus sent measured less by a third than did the several articles in attack that had been printed in that journal. The *New York Times* certainly is one of greatest of American newspapers, but even the great have their limitations. The reply thus rejected is the chief corner-stone of this pamphlet.

The *Times* introduces the pedigree with the statement that it is "as Mr. Avery gave it out to-night." It begins with the Duke of Clarence and ends with John D. Rockefeller. This pedigree was not given out by me. The first part thereof was evidently abridged from the royal ancestry of Susanna Palmes the wife of Samuel Avery, as printed in a family history published by H. D. L. Sweet of Syracuse, in 1894. Mr. Sweet copied the ancestral line from another family history that was published in 1887. The latter part of the abridged pedigree consists of a continuation of the line from Susanna (Palmes) Avery to Mr. Rockefeller. Every item of the pedigree as printed in the *Times* and charged to me is included in Mr. Sweet's book. It is worthy of notice that this pedigree, which is a quarter of a century old, was mutilated by cutting off the first twenty-three generations, thus eliminating sixteen kings of England, one king of Scotland, and the daughters of a king of Castile, a king of France, and an emperor of Germany, and beginning, in the twenty-fourth generation, with the unfortunate George Plantagenet, the Duke of Clarence.

As the present historian of the Averys of Groton, I am rewriting Mr. Sweet's work. Aware of the unpleasant suspicion that is attached to some American royal pedigrees, I decided not to reprint the Susanna Palmes ancestry unless I could have it verified by the highest authority in such matters, the Herald's College at London, a crown office. I forwarded to the college certified copies of testimony taken in Massachusetts courts, and got the certificate. This pedigree, thus revised, corrected, and certified, will first be printed in my "The Groton Avery Clan," now in press. At my request, Mr. Rockefeller helped me to pay the charges of the Herald's College. Other than this, he has

had nothing to do with the pedigree in question. As the pedigree that I am going to publish contains the link hammered by Wharton Dickinson, I undertake to show the identity hereinbefore mentioned, not as a matter of personal controversy or family pride, but as an historical fact.

Before I pass on to the main point at issue, I rise, just for a moment, to a question of personal privilege. In an article printed October 11, the *Times* says that "According to the family tree put forward by Elroy M. Avery of Cleveland for himself and Mr. Rockefeller they are both descended from John Humphrey of Boston." As already stated, this family tree was not put forward by me. Nor is it true that we "are both descended from John Humphrey of Boston." Mr. Rockefeller is; I am not. I have never pretended to have a royal pedigree and am quite satisfied with the fact that, prior to his migration, my first American Avery ancestor was an English weaver.

The discussion of this question naturally divides itself into two parts:

First, An examination of the grounds on which such identity is denied.

Second, A statement of the reasons why such identity is affirmed.

2. DENIAL.

It is no part of my duty to tell when the Lady Susan was born, when she was married, or when her first child was born. It is enough for me, in this discussion, to prove that she married the John Humphrey who, in 1634, came to Massachusetts as an assistant to the governor. Having done that, my case is complete and I might safely leave the puzzles to Mr. Dickinson as profitable exercises in his chosen field. But I venture one or two friendly suggestions. The assurance of the *Times* that "the genealogists do not state in what order the children came or at what intervals," and that "it is impossible to state accurately the year in which Lady Susan first saw the light," is worthy of acceptance by Mr. Dickinson, who, in his citation from Collins' *Peerage*, numbers the children as he names them; in the copy of Collins before me there are no such numbers. The several authorities cited by the critic do not agree as to the number of the children, their names, or the order in which they are named. But they all give first the list of sons and then the list of daughters. In each case, the sons who died are named before the sons who lived, and the daughters who died before the daughters who lived. It is not incumbent upon us to believe that all of the sons were born before any of the daughters, or that the sons who died were born before any of the sons who lived, or that the daughters who died were born before any of the daughters who lived. Yet Mr. Dickinson accepts all of these improbabilities to the end that he may bring in Susan as the seventh daughter and next to the youngest child. I admit that the Lady Susan, wife of "Humphreys of Kent," could hardly have been a mother at ten years of age, but she might have been a mother at seventeen or eighteen, and it is easy to arrange the names of the children in strict conformity with all the known facts and with some of the inferences in such a way as to show that the Lady Susan was born as early as 1603 or 1604, instead of in 1610 or 1615, as claimed by Mr. Dickinson. Of course, it is not certain that any one of the several possible lists thus framed is correct, but it may be correct,

and my guesswork is just as legitimate as Wharton Dickinson's. Then, too, there are the possibilities of several sets of twins, which smoothes the way to further flights of fancy. But, as will appear more plainly further on, it matters little, in the present discussion, whether or not the Lady Susan was or could have been the mother of the John Humfrey, who, it is alleged, was born about 1621.

In Mr. Dickinson's first letter to the *Times* he makes the important declaration that "In the Humphrey Genealogy, Page 89, it is stated that John Humfrey, Jr., was 20 years of age in 1641, putting his birth in 1621." Mr. Dickinson's quotation is inaccurate. Dr. Humphrey's statement is that the son John "was probably twenty or thereabouts at that date." The "probably" and "thereabouts" of the book lack the positiveness of the citation of the critic. But a previously unnoted piece of evidence was brought out at the December (1911) meeting of The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, showing that on March 14, 1649-50, "Humphrey, (————), gent. of kin to (Theophilus, 4th) Earl of Lincoln, and a son of a colonel" was "created M. A. by dispensation" by Oxford University, his parentage being given as "Sarah"—a mistake for Susan—"daughter of Thomas, 3rd Earl of Lincoln, married to ——— Humphreys, of the county of Kent, esq."³ To this quotation is added the editorial statement that "the recipient of the honorary degree was clearly that Colonel John Humfrey, the eldest son of Colonel John Humfrey the Massachusetts magistrate, who in 1641 was admitted a member of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company in Boston."⁴ But even this affirmation of the Oxford records that the Lady Susan was the mother of the son John doubtless must give way before the proof that the said John was the son of Elizabeth, the first wife of the Massachusetts magistrate who married the Lady Susan as his second wife. In the Visitation of Dorset, 1623, page 57, appears the pedigree of a John Humfrey. This John Humfrey is recorded as son

³ Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*, vol. 2, p. 766.

⁴ See Publications of The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, vol. 14, pp. 116, 117, and Roberts' *History of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company*, vol. 1, p. 116.

and heir of "Michael Humfrey of Chaldon in com. Dorset," and aged then 26 years, with wife Elizabeth, daughter of "Herbert Pelham of Compton in com. Dorset," and John Humfrey, *aged one year*.⁵ Comparison of the signature to this pedigree with the signature of John Humfrey to a letter written in 1630⁶ to his brother-in-law, Isaac Johnson, shows clearly the identity of the husband of Elizabeth Pelham in 1623 with the husband of the Lady Susan Clinton in 1630. The two autographs may be seen side by side in the New England Historical and Genealogical Register, vol. 65, p. 86, and justify the statement there made that "any expert in hand writing would pronounce them belonging to the same hand." Moreover, the arms in the seal following the signature of 1623 appear to be the same as those accompanying that of 1630. Still further corroborative suggestion lies in the fact that, in the list of the Cape Ann adventurers, submitted by John White, Oct. 12, 1634, appear the names of this Michael Humfrey, deceased, and of "John Humfrey, gent., living in New England."⁷ If this identity is accepted, and it seems to be definitely established, it knocks the keystone from Wharton Dickinson's elaborate arch and leaves it in irretrievable ruin. Unfortunately, I do not know just when John Humfrey married his second wife, or just when his daughter, Ann, was born, but it is to be noticed that this first wife, Elizabeth Pelham, was the daughter of Herbert Pelham by his second wife, Elizabeth West, daughter of Thomas, Lord De la Warr, and that the descendants of Colonel John Humfrey by this first wife (if there are any) have a royal ancestry through the Pelham-West line. I have the assurance of one who is probably the leading New England genealogist and antiquarian now living that these statements concerning Elizabeth Pelham are probably correct, and the offer of another genealogist distinguished for his English research work to furnish me with proof of the facts. Unfortunately, I can ill afford to pay the price asked for the proof, and the whole matter is quite aside from the question under discussion.

⁵ Harleian MS. 1166, fo. 9b.

⁶ Mass. Historical Society Collections, vol. 6, pl. 1.

⁷ New England Historical and Genealogical Register, vol. 61, p. 280.

Then there is Mr. Dickinson's merry query, Why did not Col. Humfrey have a daughter, Susan, named after her illustrious mother? The implied argument is not conclusive; a great many parents fail to name a daughter for the mother. I think that an examination of almost any family history will show that they who do not name a daughter for the mother are more numerous than are they who do. Moreover, the very list given by Mr. Dickinson shows that this "John Humphrey of the Boston Colony," whom the critic is trying to discredit, named his fifth son Theophilus for the brother of the Lady Susan, his sixth son Thomas for the father of the Lady Susan, and two daughters Ann and Dorcas for two of the sisters of the Lady Susan. This which he did is very much more significant than that which he did not.

In his letter, dated October 9, 1911, and printed in the *Times* of the following day, Mr. Dickinson points to the record of the marriage license of Thomas Sewell to Susan Humfrey, widow of John Humfrey, London, Sept. 10, 1624, and asks, "How about this?" I find it not easy to answer as courteously as I desire. This widow could not have been the daughter of the Earl of Lincoln, for Mr. Wharton Dickinson solemnly affirms that the Lady Susan "could not possibly have been born before 1610 and most likely as late as 1615." Ergo, she could not have been a widow ready for a second marriage in 1624. Nor could she have been the widow of Col. John Humfrey who came with his wife to Boston in 1634. The evident and sufficient answer is that she was another Susan who had married another John Humfrey. County Kent was a veritable hot-bed of Humphreys; John Humphrey was doubtless a common name then and there as it is now and here.

I have no doubt that Mr. Dickinson made an honest effort to find all that could be found about the "obscure person" who married the Lady Susan and the person of the same name who became a Massachusetts magistrate. The trouble with his quest seems to be that he did not look in the right places. His ancient chroniclers of the British peerage, extinct, dormant, and existent, Burke, Collins, et al., could hardly be expected to tell much about an untitled Englishman who left England for America.

3. AFFIRMATION.

So much for the discussion of the grounds for Mr. Dickinson's denial of the identity that I am trying to maintain. On our way from this realm of maze and mystery into the domain of authentic history, it is probable that a brief historical outline will enable some of the readers of this pamphlet to follow, more easily than they otherwise would, the evidence that I am about to offer. In 1606, King James I. of England granted the first charter of Virginia. This charter gave lands along the North American coast to two companies, one of which has its headquarters at London and the other at Plymouth, England. In 1620, the Plymouth company was reorganized as the Council for New England. In 1628, this Plymouth Council "granted to six patentees, of whom John Humphrey and John Endicott were destined to be most prominent, territory extending from the Atlantic to the Western Ocean, and in width from a line running three miles north of the Merrimac to one running three miles south of the Charles. This was the Massachusetts Bay Company."⁸ Then, under date of March 4, 1628-29, King Charles I. granted the famous charter of Massachusetts Bay. In the following August, the company adopted a resolution for the transfer of the charter and the government from England to New England, thus making necessary the election of officers who were willing to migrate to Massachusetts. This charter provided that "from henceforth for ever, there shalbe one Governor, one Deputy Governor, and eightene Assistants of the same Company." In October of that year, John Winthrop was chosen governor and John Humfrey was chosen deputy-governor of the company. But Humfrey did not come to America with Winthrop and the charter, and, on the eve of embarkation, Thomas Dudley was chosen (March 23, 1630) deputy-governor in Humfrey's stead."

⁸ J. Franklin Jameson's Dictionary of United States History, p. 405.

^{*} Massachusetts Colony Records, vol. 1, pp. 10, 70.

At the time of the great Puritan migration thus begun by Winthrop and his associates, the head of the house of Clinton was Theophilus, the fourth Earl of Lincoln, and many facts attest the interest of the family in New England colonization. For example, it is undisputed that one of the earl's sisters married John, the son and heir of the famous Sir Ferdinando Gorges, probably the premier land-grabber of his day. It is not disputed that another sister, Arbella, married Isaac Johnson and that they both came out with Winthrop in 1630, and both died in the first year in America, and that Winthrop's flag-ship was named for her. It is not disputed that the earl's faithful steward, Thomas Dudley, came over with Governor Winthrop as deputy-governor of the colony, and that Simon Bradstreet, who had been trained in the duties of a steward by Dudley in the household of the earl, also came. What more natural, nay, inevitable, than the conclusion that the John Humphrey who was one of the six original patentees of Massachusetts (1628) and who was mentioned by name fourteen times in the Massachusetts charter of 1629, and who now was so closely associated with the emigrants above named, was another brother-in-law of the earl? Had he not been allied to the Clinton family, some one would have noted the identity of name which would have been remarkable because of the lack of identity of person. But I need not lean on "natural conclusions," for I have direct and authoritative testimony to introduce.

There now remains for me to show by proof incontrovertible that the John Humphrey of the Massachusetts company and colony did marry Susan, the daughter of the third Earl of Lincoln—a task so simple that I hesitate to lay the proof before my readers. I first turn (perhaps from force of habit) to a comprehensive and convenient work edited by Gen. James Grant Wilson and the late John Fiske¹⁰, and in it read, among other things recorded of John Humphrey, that he was chosen deputy-governor of Massachusetts "and came to New England in 1634, with his wife, Lady Susan, daughter of the Earl of Lincoln." Then comes John Gorham Palfrey¹¹ who tells of the election of

¹⁰ Appleton's Cyclopædia of American Biography, vol. 3, p. 311.

¹¹ Compendious History of New England, vol. 1, p. 106.

Winthrop as governor and Humphrey as deputy-governor, and adds that "Humphrey was a gentleman of special parts, of learning and activity, and a godly man; in the home of his father-in-law, Thomas, third Earl of Lincoln, the head, in that day, of the now ducal house of Newcastle, he had been the familiar companion of the patriotic nobles. Of the Assistants, Isaac Johnson, esteemed the richest of the emigrants, was another son-in-law of Lord Lincoln, and a landholder in three counties."

John Humphrey lived at Saugus (now Lynn), the historian of which town¹² says that "Mr. John Humfrey was a native of Dorchester in Dorsetshire, England, a lawyer, and a man of considerable wealth and good reputation. He married Susan, the second daughter of Thomas, Earl of Lincoln, and sister of Frances, the wife of Mr. John Gorges, and of Arabella, the wife of Mr. Isaac Johnson."

Hildredth says¹³ that in 1628 "John Humphrey, a brother-in-law of the Earl of Lincoln, John Endicott, and four others, gentlemen of Dorchester, obtained at White's instigation, from the Council for New England, a grant of the coast between Laconia on the one side and the Plymouth patent on the other, including the whole of Massachusetts Bay." Under date of 1634, he further says¹⁴: "While the court was still sitting, six 'great ships' arrived, 'with store of passengers and cattle,' followed within a month by fifteen more. John Humphrey, one of the original patentees of the company, but who had hitherto remained at home, came out in one of these ships, with his wife, the Lady Susan."

Dean Dudley, who spent a year in England collecting material, examining pedigrees, parish registers, wills, local histories, etc., says¹⁵: "Earl Theophilus Clinton was the fifth in descent from Edmund Dudley, the minister of Henry VII. One of the sisters of Theophilus married John Gorges, son and heir of Sir Ferdinando; another married John Humphrey, who was among

¹² History of Lynn, pp. 197, 198.

¹³ History of the United States, edition of 1887, vol. 1, chap. 7, p. 177.

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 217.

¹⁵ History of the Dudley Family, p. 53.

our pilgrim [Puritan] fathers; and the celebrated Arbella, for whom one of their first ships was named and who came over in it and died at Salem in 1630, was another sister of Theophilus, being the wife of Isaac Johnson, who died soon after at Boston, Mass."

George E. Ellis says¹⁶ that "Winthrop, Saltonstall, Humphrey, Johnson, and Dudley had no need to seek any bettering of their fortunes. Winthrop had his manor and freehold, and his right of church presentation in the parish of his ancestors; Humphrey and Johnson were the husbands of daughters of the Earl of Lincoln; and Dudley held the responsible office of his steward."

1946416

In a description of the passengers in the "Arbella." William Carlos Martyn says¹⁷ of Humphrey, "who is here to bid his friends God speed," that "he is a son-in-law of the Earl of Lincoln, the head, in that day, of the now ducal house of Newcastle."

Charles Francis Adams speaks¹⁸ of Cradock and Saltonstall who were in England when the Gorges and Gardiner petition was making trouble and adds: "With them was John Humphrey, formerly deputy governor, and one of the original patentees of the company, who had married a daughter of the Earl of Lincoln."

Augustine Jones¹⁹ speaks of "Isaac Johnson, the brother-in-law of the [fourth] earl" and of "Lady Susan Humphrey, a sister of the Earl of Lincoln. . . . Her husband, John Humphrey, was one of the six original patentees."

The "Records of the Company of the Massachusetts Bay," as contained in the first volume of the archives of the commonwealth of Massachusetts, are printed in the third volume of the "Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society" (*Archæologia Americana*), published at Worcester, Mass., in 1857. On the fiftieth page of the chapter on the

¹⁶ The Puritan Age and Rule in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, p. 233.

¹⁷ History of the Pilgrim Fathers of New England, pp. 278 et seq.

¹⁸ Three Episodes of Massachusetts History, p. 265.

¹⁹ Life and Work of Thomas Dudley, pp. 45, 46.

origin of the company, it is stated that "John Humphrey was a son-in-law of Thomas, third Earl of Lincoln, having married his daughter Susan."

James Savage speaks²⁰ of the arrival of John Humphrey at Boston in 1634, and says that "with him, besides his wife, Susan, daughter of the illustrious Thomas Clinton, third Earl of Lincoln, and some children, Ann, Dorcas, and Sarah, he brought money, goods and cattle, for the Colony."

In a note on page 307, vol. 31, *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, the editor says that the wife of Col. John Humphrey was the Lady Susan, the daughter of the Earl of Lincoln. Many similar citations might be made from the pages of the *Register*.

In a note on page 15 of the "History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, from the First Settlement thereof in 1628 until its incorporation with the Colony of Plimouth, Province of Main, &c. by the Charter of King William and Queen Mary in 1691," by Mr. Hutchinson, Lieutenant Governor of the Massachusetts Province (second edition, 1765), one may read: "Mr. Humphrey was early engaged. He was one of the six original patentees of the Council of Plimouth. He was prevented from coming over with the charter. He married the Lady Susan, daughter of the Earl of Lincoln and brought her with their children to New England in 1632 [1634] and was immediately chosen an assistant."

In a life of Thomas Dudley, "written probably by Cotton Mather"²¹—and, if so, written before 1728—we read that "Mr. Humphreys, who had married one of the Earl of Lincoln's sisters, found himself so encumbered with businesses that he could not be ready to come along with the rest, in the year 1630."

On October 11, 1682, the Massachusetts general court granted to the Rev. William Hubbard, minister of Ipswich, fifty pounds "as a manifestation of thankfulness" for the preparation

²⁰ *Genealogical Dictionary of the First Settlers of New England* (magnum opus), vol. 5, p. 406.

²¹ *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, series 1, vol. 11, p. 216.

of his "General History of New England from Discovery to MDCLXXX." This history is printed in the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, series 2, vol. 5. On page 170 (edition of 1848), Hubbard says: "That very year when that discovery was made came into New England several persons of note, amongst whom was Mr. Humphrey, who though he was formerly chosen Deputy Governor, came not over till the year 1634, bringing along with him his noble consort, the Lady Susan, sister to the Earl of Lincoln." It is very probable that Hubbard was personally acquainted with Humfrey.

The testimony of J. A. Doyle is especially valuable, being given by an English student from an English point of view. Doyle was a Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, England. He says²²: "More than one of Winthrop's associates was, like himself, abandoning ease, wealth, and the possibility of a brilliant public career. Such were the Deputy-Governor, John Humphrey, and Isaac Johnson. Slightly, if at all, lower in rank was Thomas Dudley, a stern Puritan who had served in the Huguenot army under Henry the Fourth. All these were connected with the Earl of Lincoln, the head of a great Protestant family, Humphrey and Johnson as his sons-in-law, Dudley as the steward of his household."

Pishy Thompson, another English historical writer, in speaking of the Clinton family, says²³: "Two ladies of this family, Lady Arabella, the wife of Isaac Johnson of Clipstone, in Rutlandshire, and Lady Susanna, the wife of John Humfrey, two of the daughters of Thomas, the third Earl, removed themselves to the new country in the prime of life."

In the first part of *The Humphreys' Family in America*, the very book quoted by the *Times'* critic, one may find half a dozen quotations, notes, etc., each plainly stating that John Humphrey was a son-in-law of the Earl of Lincoln. More startling still is this statement of Dr. Humphreys: "I have in my possession a deed signed by her [Ann, the daughter of John Humphrey

²² The Puritan Colonies, vol. i, p. 101.

²³ History and Antiquities of Boston [in Lincolnshire, England] and the Hundred of Skirbeck (London, 1856), p. 80.

and the mother of Susanna Palmes] and signed *with the arms of the house of Lincoln.*"

I could easily add much testimony to the same effect, but (to spare myself the labor of writing and the cost of printing, and not recklessly to abuse the patience of the reader) I come next to my star witness, the "History of New England," written by John Winthrop, the second governor of the company and the first governor of the colony of Massachusetts Bay. The "History" is in the form of a journal and covers every important occurrence from Winthrop's first embarking for America in 1630 to the year 1644. The first volume of this work was published at Hartford in 1790. The original manuscript was found in the tower of the Old South Church in Boston in 1816. The copy before me was prepared from the original manuscript by James Savage, the president of the Massachusetts Historical Society and one of the best known and most highly credited antiquaries of the last century. This contemporary evidence contains frequent references to John Humfrey and, as Winthrop was personally acquainted with Humfrey and doubtless with the family of the Earl of Lincoln, its statements are beyond question true and conclusive.

Under date of Sept. 30, 1630, Winthrop says²⁴: "About two in the morning, Mr. Isaac Johnson died; his wife, the lady Arbella, of the house of Lincoln, being dead about one month before." In a foot-note on the same page, Mr. Savage explains that the Lady Arbella, the wife of Isaac Johnson, was the daughter of the third Earl of Lincoln and that her sister, Susan, married John Humfrey. Passing over one or two similar references to Humphrey, we find,²⁵ under date of July, 1634, this all-important record: "**Mr. Humfrey and the lady Susan, his wife, one of the Earl of Lincoln's sisters, arrived here.**" The journal contains many other allusions to Humfrey, but this is enough to establish the identity of John Humfrey, the Massachusetts magistrate, with John Humfrey, the husband of the Lady Susan.

²⁴ The History of New England from 1630-1649, edition of 1853, p. 40.

²⁵ Ibid, p. 160.

If, however, some doubting critic fears that Governor Winthrop did not know Humfrey in England and that he might have been mistaken when he made this entry in his journal, let him turn to Alexander Young's "Chronicles of the First Planters of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay from 1623-1636." He will find therein abundant and conclusive evidence that Winthrop and Humfrey came into frequent personal contact in England, that they both signed the famous Agreement at Cambridge (August 26, 1629), that Humfrey was one of the four candidates for governor at the meeting when Winthrop was elected governor and Humfrey deputy-governor (Oct. 20, 1629), and that, from October 15, 1629, to March 18, 1630, they were both present at eight different meetings of the company.²⁰

At its meeting in December, 1911, the Colonial Society of Massachusetts kindly listened to the reading of a paper prepared by me concerning this disputed identity. The members present seemed to agree with my conclusions and several of the most prominent voiced such agreement and added confirmatory testimony. The editor of the society's publications printed a résumé of the paper and wrote to me saying: "Winthrop was intimately acquainted with Humfrey, and his statement is in itself ample proof," and that "The New York genealogist whom you do not mention by name may think there is some doubt in the matter, but we in this part of the country know there is none; and such being the case, it is needless to slay the slain in the Transactions of the Colonial Society." This seems to be severe as to me and absolutely cruel as to Mr. Wharton Dickinson. But it comes pretty near putting the official approval of the society on the affirmation of the identity in question, although the assumption that every one in that "part of the country" is as well informed on the subject as are the members of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts is, possibly, too flattering to the attainments of the people of the Old Bay State. Moreover, there are many fairly intelligent persons who do not live in eastern Massachusetts, and, as already stated, some of them (even some newspaper scribes) were led astray of the critic of the *New York Times*.

²⁰ Massachusetts Colony Records, vol. 1, pp. 54, 56, 58, 60, 61, 63, 67, 69.

Just a few words in conclusion. It is pretty certain that Col. John Humfrey of Massachusetts had a son John, that said son was a year old at the date of the Dorset Visitation of 1623, and that his mother was Elizabeth, the daughter of Herbert Pelham and the first wife of our Massachusetts magistrate. It is not known when the Lady Susan Clinton, the second wife, was born. It is not certain that she was the seventh of the nine daughters, as the critic assumes; the "History of Lynn" says that she was the second daughter. The arrangement of the names of the seventeen children as given by Collins, evidently is not chronological. In fact, there is nothing to show that most of the nine daughters were not born prior to the birth of Theophilus, the third son and the fourth earl, and early enough to have become the second wife of Colonel John Humfrey and the mother of seven of his children, one of whom, as we have seen used the Lincoln coat of arms in sealing a formal legal document. Still less is there any reason for us to assume, as Mr. Dickinson practically asks us to assume, that, as the Lady Susan was not likely to have been a mother at the age of eleven years, John Winthrop, a personal acquaintance of John Humfrey and his wife, and a long line of historians from Hubbard and Hutchinson to Hildredth, Doyle, and Fiske, either did not know what they were talking about or that (probably being bribed by Mr. Rockefeller) they deliberately entered into a conspiracy to distort the facts. I trust that I may be excused for having, in this particular instance, more confidence in the positive statement of Governor Winthrop than I have in the inferences of the critic who is more or less responsible for all this trouble.

I desire to express my gratitude to Dr. Melville M. Bigelow, editor of the Province Laws of Massachusetts, to J. Gardner Bartlett of the New England Historic Genealogical Society's committee on English Research, to Albert Matthews, editor of the Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, and to Henry E. Woods, former editor of the New England Historical and Genealogical Register and now commissioner of public records of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, for many favors and valuable assistance given in my study of this question.

ELROY M. AVERY.

Cleveland, June, 1912.

POSTSCRIPT.

A few months ago, I sent a letter to the editor of the *Boston Transcript* who, with a degree of fairness that I am glad to believe is characteristic, printed it on the editorial page of that able journal (November 22, 1911) without change and with the addition of a generous note. As that letter contains a definite statement of some facts that I should like to put on more permanent record, I here give so much thereof as is not covered in the preceding pages of this pamphlet.

To the Editor of the Transcript:

A New England friend has sent to me a newspaper clipping which I understand to be taken from the editorial columns of the *Transcript* of October 10, last. The article has the caption "John D.'s Sad Error," and is evidently based on articles printed in the *New York Times* in which I am represented as having "given out" a certain pedigree that shows that Mr. Rockefeller is a descendant of kings, and that this family tree was "put forward by Elroy M. Avery of Cleveland for himself and Mr. Rockefeller." Some of these articles, for there are several of them, contain communications from Mr. Wharton Dickinson alleging that one of the links in the ancestral chain is fatally defective. Owing to the prominence of Mr. Rockefeller, the pedigree and criticism have been reproduced in numerous newspapers with comments wise and otherwise. There have been allusions to "purveyors of pedigrees for rich men," and your own article speaks of me as Mr. Rockefeller's genealogist and as "his hired man." If I had been guilty of the fraudulent fabrication of a pedigree for any person, I would be fair game for any editorial sportsman. If I have not thus erred, I think that you ought to make as full reparation as is consistent with your grip on "The Dogma of Journalistic Inerrancy."

* * * * *

As the present family historian, for Mr. Sweet is dead, I am rewriting Mr. Sweet's work and bringing it down to the present time as well as I can do so. It is a "labor of love"; I know of no

one who ever published a family history except at a pecuniary loss. I decided not to reprint the royal pedigree of the wife of Samuel Avery unless I could have it verified by the highest authority in such matters—the College of Heralds at London, a crown office. Certified copies of court testimony and other evidences were secured by me and forwarded to London at the cost of much effort and some money. I got the certificate and, at my request, Mr. Rockefeller helped me pay for it. He has not manifested as much interest in the matter as have many others; not as much as I then expected that he would manifest. The pedigree, revised, corrected, and certified by the College of Heralds, will first be published in my “The Groton Avery Clan,” now in press.

* * * * *

The *Transcript* speaks of me as Mr. Rockefeller’s genealogist. This is true only in so far as Mr. Rockefeller is a member of the Groton Avery clan. I have not gone a step out of my way to trace his pedigree; I have ignored his ancestry back of the point where it joins the Avery line.

The *Transcript* calls me Mr. Rockefeller’s “hired man.” This is wholly unwarranted. Mr. Rockefeller has never hired me; he has never paid me a cent for services rendered to him in this or any other matter; he has not promised to do so; I do not expect that he will do so; I know of no reason why he should do so. I am the historian of the Groton Averys and am serving them to the best of my ability; I am not the genealogist of Mr. Rockefeller or of his family and am serving them only because they are so fortunate as to have places in the Groton Avery clan. I hope that this is satisfactorily definite.

Cleveland, Nov. 17, 1911.

ELROY M. AVERY.

Mr. Avery has taken our pleasantries rather too seriously. In respect to the portions of the article in which errors have been made, we regret these very much, but there was no intention to reflect in any way discreditably upon a scholar so well known as Mr. Avery. THE EDITOR.

The first of these is the fact that the
 second of these is the fact that the
 third of these is the fact that the
 fourth of these is the fact that the
 fifth of these is the fact that the
 sixth of these is the fact that the
 seventh of these is the fact that the
 eighth of these is the fact that the
 ninth of these is the fact that the
 tenth of these is the fact that the

The first of these is the fact that the
 second of these is the fact that the
 third of these is the fact that the
 fourth of these is the fact that the
 fifth of these is the fact that the
 sixth of these is the fact that the
 seventh of these is the fact that the
 eighth of these is the fact that the
 ninth of these is the fact that the
 tenth of these is the fact that the

The first of these is the fact that the
 second of these is the fact that the
 third of these is the fact that the
 fourth of these is the fact that the
 fifth of these is the fact that the
 sixth of these is the fact that the
 seventh of these is the fact that the
 eighth of these is the fact that the
 ninth of these is the fact that the
 tenth of these is the fact that the

